App. F. IX-4

*Previous References*

1930
( 9.7 )

File No. 87-30
Serial Nos. 1 & 2.

**PRESERVED**

Preserve

*Later References*
I & C 189-35 (1-3)
4.F. 74-43 (1-2)

P 23 (E)

# General and Revenue Secretariat

*Serial Nos.* 2

**Part B for** November 1930

SUBJECT.

Re- Position of Surety in the case of H.B. & Motor advances -

2) To the Secretary, State Life Insurance Committee,
Re No 6043 of 6. XI. 30

States that the Surety may be regarded as occupying the same position as any other private person that had offered the Security that the amount of the Surety's policy in the State Life Insurance should not be treated as liable for the deficiency in the principal's account etc

Rec/30

2089/H

General and Revenue Secretariat

G. 2 File No. 87

App. F. III—2

of 1929 30

Serial No.

Letter No: 14197 dt 18.2.30 from the Secretary, Insurance Committee requesting that the position of the security in the case of house building et motor car advances may be made clear & suggesting that he may be regarded as occupying the same position as that another private person offered as security & his Government Insurance amount treated as not liable for the Principal's debts.

Vide ship on cover G. 97-08. H: V

Srtd: that Insurance Policies cannot be accepted as Collateral Security was laid down in GO No: 7765-805/G.2 97-08.4 dt the 10th Dec: 09 (Dl: W) this was based on the previous decision in G.2 232-07. referred to at Flag H. Hence & this file has been destroyed.

In a later order passed in October 1914, that Govt was advised among other things that the Dy: Commr must satisfy himself about any immovable property offered as Collateral Security. In view of this order, the nature of security to be furnished is left to the discretion of the Dy: Commr who will have to be satisfied with the same when the advance is paid & refuse to accept the Insurance Policies offered as Collateral Security.

Srtd: for orders with references. The case will be passed on to Mr: G. S. Ranjappa for working on Motor Car Advances

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—20-4-29

4 yrs

2089/H

General and Revenue Secretariat | G 7 File No. 87 of 1930

Serial No.

5 There is nothing to be noted on the Car advance except it be that whenever Car advances have been sanctioned to Govt officers who get superannuated before Complete recovery of advances can be effected, a Saving clause used to be added to the G.O: that the amount of advance outstanding at the time of superannuation should be adjusted out of the insurance Amount.

6 This direction only in some G.Os ~~of Govt. Secretariat Depts~~ sanctioning either H.B or Car advances, the Legl: Advr: thinks unnecessary in view of the fact that at the time of the settlement of the insurance claim, intimations are invariably received from the Comptroller or the Head of the Office, regarding the amounts due to Govt: on various accounts - (vide para 1 of his letter dated 18/2/30). This is the 1st point for orders -

7 The 2nd point for orders is about the liability of the insurance amount of a surety for the amount due by the Principal - vide paras 2 and 3 of this letter. Legal Remembrance may be requested to favour his opinion on this point.

8 Subt for orders

Gp 24/2nd 1.3.30

9 As the decision in para 3 involves a point of law the Ld. may be consulted in the first instance as to whether the Comptroller's view in para 3 may be accepted

(Illegible) 6.3.30

11493/30

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—20-4-29

87

Serial No.

10 The insurance bonus can be collared for the adjustment of the H.B. (or car) advance taken by an officer. Do not see what objection there is for effecting a similar adjustment in respect of the dues for the payment of which the bank stood surety. The surety's liability is co-extensive with that of the Principal.

11 The insurance amount is payable to the officer himself, if he is alive when it falls due, and there can be no legal objection to the amount due to ~~for~~ him being set off whether as the principal debtor or surety having deducted ~~at the~~ out of the insurance bonus, when ~~having~~ agreed to the arrangement.

12 Whether such deduction can be made when the bonus is payable to the nominee or heirs of the insured after his death, is another matter which does not arise for consideration now. Being a family provision and not attachable for debts contracted by the insured, the heirs will have a preferential claim

13 If the view expressed at A in the P.N.D is accepted, the [illegible] of personal security of a fresh officer will not be sufficiently safeguard for interests against default in the payment of instalments of H.B. advances and the



[illegible]

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. 87 of 1929-30

Serial No.

will have also arisen in the light of legal advice.

14 To L. R. with compliments for favour of opinion on the point raised in the D.O.

13.3.30

L. O

84
25.3.30

15 The question raised by the Secy, Insurance Committee in his letter of the 18th Feb 1930 involves the consideration of the more general question viz whether the insurance bonus due to Govt officials in the Official Branch can be made liable for debts due to Govt by the insured. and whether Govt would be in order when they deduct ~~the~~ such amounts ~~due to Govt by the insured~~ while making payments on the maturity of the policy.

16. The Rules of the Official Branch are rules made by Government in their Executive Capacity and not under any Statute. Though they cannot therefore have the force of law, yet they govern the Contract between the Government and the Officer who is under the rules bound to insure

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 87 of 1929

Serial No.

his life

17 Under the rules the bonus ~~payable~~ secured by a policy in the Official Branch can only be paid to the insured person if he is alive when the policy matures or to any one whom he may have "nominated" for the purpose during his lifetime: failing both it is payable to the person or persons entitled to receive it under rule 23. If the amount does not exceed Rs 2000/-, the President of the Committee has the power of ascertaining such person and payment made to him is a valid discharge under Reg IV of 1917.

18 Under section 60 cl (p) of the Mysore Civil Procedure Code, the bonuses "payable or paid" in the Official Branch are protected from attachment for for any debt due or contracted by the officer. This shows that the officer as well as his nominees or heirs, in case of the officer's death, are entitled to the bonus free from all debts incurred by the officer. It is therefore pointed out in Hydere Khan vs Thayaranissa (1 Mysore Law Rep 98)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 81 of 1930

Serial No.

that "it is one of the special incidents of what is known as the "official Branch" of the Mysore State life Insurance, which is confined to employees of Government, that insured officials are not authorised to assign away their policies during their life-time". They have therefore no disposing powers over their policies except to the extent that they can make a nomination to take effect after their death and even this nomination is valid only when it is accepted and registered in the books of the Insurance Committee - (22 Mysore ch ct Reports 274).

It is therefore clear that the insured official or his nominees or heirs, as the case may be, are entitled to the bonus without any deduction being made on account of debts due by the insured. Para 2 of rule 23 however provides that payments under the rule should be subject to deduction of any amount due to Govt by the insured. This is however interpreted in G.O. No: Fl 3644-6/G 7 78-23-2 of

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 87 of 1930

Serial No.

7th January 1924 to mean to apply only to amounts due by the insured to Govt in his official capacity and not to those which he may owe to Govt as a private person. It is not easy to see the differentiation aimed at. Is the amount due under a motor or a house building advance that due from the officer in his official capacity or is he to be treated as a private person in such cases? The latter view seems correct, in which case there is no use in taking the life insurance policy in the Official Branch as securities for any such loans.

20 The bonus due under such policies is, according to Mysore Law Journal 98, property restricted in its enjoyment to the owner personally, or in certain cases to his nominees or heirs. Hence no interest therein can be transfered by the owner of it, since under Sec 6 cl (d) of the Transfer of Property Regulation, such property is not transferable

21 Under these circumstances, the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

50 34/1
D3 489.7

8

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 87 of 1930

Serial No.

Present practice of advancing loans on the securities of these policies has to be discontinued. This appears to have been the policy of Govt settled in G. 7 232-1907 The records of which, it is regretted are said to have been destroyed.

84/Law

15007
26/5

DOF 19.5.30

2V
Finl Branch) P. M. 22/5.

A.G. 23/5/30

Secy,

US Please put up the collection leading to C

L 2.6.30

* The Collection is now in the Record (Vide Rule 23)

Dft. calling for a copy of G.O. & submission for appd. or orders!

A copy of G.O. obtained from the Ins. Office. is submitted

AR 6/6/30

24 The Collection is now ~~readily~~ available submitted

My 5/7/30

A.G. 26.7.30

Secy,

25 This is an important collection and the present-Xyal opinion seems to be against the reservation in Rule 23 of the Insurance only. The collection relating to the Indian states may be heard and put up.

L 26/7/30. A

GEN. & REV. SECTT. 6470 28 JUNE 1930 L. S. G. BRANCH

29 R

L.S. 28/6

1444
26/7

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

5034/x

9

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 87 of 1930.

Serial No.

26 Rec. Cttee in g. No. 29-23 re the amendment of Rule 23 of the Ins. Rules is submitted—

A
5/8/30

~~Secretary~~ A
5/8/30.

FI Secy

1946
11/8

27 In view of the legal opinion, and of the ruling contained in the G.O. of 7th June 1924, it is not possible to make the Insurance bonus of a Surety liable to the Principal's dues.

28 A draft accepting the view contained in the last sentence in the Insurance Dept's letter of 18th Febry 1930 and ~~stating~~ ruling that it is not necessary in future to register the names of sureties in the books of the Insurance office may be submitted.

29 As regards the case of the Principal debtors themselves, it is desirable to continue the existing practice of sending ~~a~~ to the Insurance Dept. the ~~names~~ copies of G.O.s sanctioning the grant of H.B. Motor car or other advances. These advances are sanctioned by Govt. on officers of posts, as a concession incidental to their official position and so long as Rule 23 of the Insurance Rules is not abrogated, it is necessary that the Insurance office should be apprised of the Govt. Dues payable by the insured Depts.

This should be included in the draft. L
20.9.30.
A

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 02328—GPB—10,000—22-4-30

File No [illegible] of 193

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

A Off. Conveying the Secretary's direction in paras 28 & 29 of the Office note is submitted for approval & orders. Re para 29, The instructions & departmental circulated for the Branch, [illegible] have not been included in the Off. will be noted.

AV
25.9.30. 26.9.30

Fair & draft [illegible]

[illegible]
4.10.30

Typed Off submitted
AV
7/10/30

Fair & draft submitted please
[illegible]
8.10.30

Typed Off submitted
AV
13.10.30.

Draft for approval
[illegible]
14.10.30

A. Secy.

Fair typed Draft for Appr
[illegible]
15.10.30

[illegible]

Refer paras 27, 28 & 29 ante.

Draft for approval
[illegible]
31.10.30

Hon. member

Approved by Member.

[illegible]

OFFICE OF THE HON'BLE MEMBER OF COUNCIL
1 NOV. 1930
No. 1394

Note–Contn. Sheet

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 87 of 1930.

| Serial No. | |
|---|---|
| 2 | Dg no Ins Secty no 4041 D 6/11/30 States that in the case of H.B. & motor car advances, no difficulties for the Registration of the names of Societies in the Books of the Ins Office, and that the Principal debtors themselves, it is necessary that the Ins Office should be apprised of the dues payable by the Insured & Govt, and that the present practice of sending copies of G.O.s to Ins Office will continue. Memo no 4048 D/6.11.30 A the Comptr. |

Remains a copy.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 02553—50,000—GPB—8-7 30

O. 20]

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
28 JUNE 1930
No. N

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
MYSORE STATE LIFE INSURANCE COMMITTEE.

No. 22531 Bangalore, dated 28th June 1930. 192

28

AV

FROM

~~S. SRINIVASAYYA, Esq., B.A.,~~

The *Secretary, Mysore State Life Insurance Committee,*
*Bangalore.*

GENL. & REV. SECTT.
30
1 - 1 JULY
FINANCIAL BRANCH

To

RAJASEVAPARAYANA
B. Sreenivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Financial Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

6034 | 2d dm ds 8/7

SIR,

In continuation of this office Nos. 14197 and 19016 dated the 28th March 1930 and 8th May 1930 respectively, I have the honour to request you to be so good as to communicate the orders of Government in the matter of noting in the books of this office, the grant of House Building and other advances.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Secretary,
Insurance Committee.

DS

28/6

5464 Pg

O. 20]

5084/R
8.5.30.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
MYSORE STATE LIFE INSURANCE COMMITTEE.

No. 19016

*Bangalore, dated* 7th May 1930.

8

FROM

~~S. SHAMANNA, Esq., B.A.,~~
The *Secretary, Mysore State Life Insurance Committee,*
*Bangalore.*

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
8 MAY 1930

AN

To

RAJASEVAPARAYANA
B. Sreenivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Financial Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

D. No. 4234. Sent to proctor Br on 11/4 Re Insurance Govindaraja Naidu Hd Clerk

SIR,

I have the honour to invite reference to this office letter No. 16951 dated the 28th March 1930, and to request you to be so good as to communicate the orders of Government about the adoption of some uniform procedure in the matter of noting in the books of this office the grants of House Building and other advances to the insured officials.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Secretary,
Insurance Committee. 7/5/30

DS

9/5

(Jail. 4234)

The Previous Cmte. has ~~Exec~~ Rep. to Govt. Prot. Br. on 11.4.1930. This may be dealt in Cmte.

Submitted
By
9.5.1930.

9.5.30

Yes.
9-5-30

Prot. Br with Connects

9/5

4234

O. 20]

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
MYSORE STATE LIFE INSURANCE COMMITTEE.

No. 16957.

*Bangalore, dated* 28th March 1930.

FROM

S. SHAMANNA, Esq.

The *Secretary, Mysore State Life Insurance Committee,*
*Bangalore.*

To

RAJASEVAPARAYANA
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Financial Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
28 MAR 1930

SIR,

In continuation of this office No.14197 dated 18-2-30, I have the honour to state that the case of the Insured, Mr. V. Govindarajulu Naidu, Head Clerk, Chief Conservator's Office and holder of policy Nos. 4366 etc., has since been disposed of as the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District released him from his suretyship.

I therefore request the favour of orders of Government on the general point raised in my previous letter in the matter of adoption of a uniform procedure about the intimations of the grant of House Building and other advances.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Secretary,
Insurance Committee.

DS

The previous Corr^ce - Fin^l. D. no. 3489 - was sent to L. R. on 15-3-1930. This may be sent in Corr^ce for sending back the file.

11.4.30.

The Supdt., P.O.D. Branch with compliments

11/4/30

O. No 3489/19 19/2

O.-20]

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
MYSORE STATE LIFE INSURANCE COMMITTEE.

No. 14197.

Bangalore, dated 13th February 1930.

18

G.J 81-80.1

FROM

S. SHAMANNA, ESQ., B.A.,
*Secretary, Mysore State Life Insurance Committee,*
*Bangalore.*

To

RAJASEVAPARAYANA
B. Sreenivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Financial Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

SIR,

I have the honour to state that a uniform procedure does not appear to be followed in communicating to this office Government Orders sanctioning House Building and Motor Car Advances and also in mentioning the names of sureties and in some cases the fact that the balance remaining unpaid will be deducted from the Life Insurance amount. When such orders are received only in some cases, it is assumed that they are intended to be noted in the ledger against the names of the officers mentioned therein--either as Principal or surety--and such note is made use of at the time of the settlement of the Insurance claim. In other cases, this office will not be aware of the grant of such advances, until an intimation is received from the Comptroller or the Head of the office at the time of the settlement of the claim, regarding the amounts due to Government on various accounts. When such information is received in all cases at the time of settlement of claims, the receipt of the Government Orders sanctioning the advances and their note in this office ledgers in a few cases, seem to be unnecessary as it does not provide for a complete check. Either all such orders should be received and noted or none should be received for the sake of uniformity. As the non-receipt of the Government Order in any particular case, does not seem to have caused any inconvenience so far, I would suggest that a uniform practice be followed of not

P.T.O.

not sending any such order to this office. I note in the margin a few Government Orders indicating the diversity of procedure now existing.

2) It is also a matter for consideration as to how far the insurance amount of a Government Official who happens to be a surety for another for such an advance is liable to be utilised for recovering the balance of the advance due by the Principal. Such liability for another's debt appears to be not contemplated by the Insurance Rules and opposed to the underlying principle of the Insurance Scheme that it should be a family provision.

A. Government orders not communicated in the case of:-

1. The late, Mr. K. Abdul Khader Khan, District Economic Superintendent, Bangalore to whom was sanctioned a house building advance of Rs.4,200/- in August 1927.

2. Rajakaryapravina P.G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L., Revenue Commissioner in Mysore to whom was sanctioned a Motor Car Advance of Rs.3,000/-

B. Government Orders communicated with out surety's name:-

1. G.O.No.Fl.8899-90/G.E.1-28 dated 31-5/1-6-28 sanctioning a further house building advance of Rs.2,400/- to Mr. K.Y. Krishnaswamy Iyengar, Superintendent, General and Revenue Secretariat.

2. G.O.No.Fl.829-31 dated 31-7/1-8-29 sanctioning a further house building advance of Rs.1,120/- to Mr. S.R. Narasimhaiya, Senior Clerk, General and Revenue Secretariat.

C. Government orders mentioning the name of surety.

1. G.O.No.Fl.1594-97/G.F.1-24-28 dated 15-8-28 granting an house building advance of Rs.2,160/- to Mr. P.S. Rangiah Naidu of Government Press, accepting the personal collateral security of Mr. V. Govindarajulu Naidu, Head Clerk, Chief Conservator's office.

2. G.O.No.Fl.1873-5/G.F.3-29-41 dated 14/18-9-29 sanctioning a motor car advance of Rs.1,300/- to Mr. B. Krishniengar, Temporary Assistant Engineer, Hassan Sub-Division accepting the collateral security of Mr. M.L. Narasimha Iyengar, Assistant Engineer, Chamarajendra Water Works, Bangalore.

3) The surety that has been accepted seems to be merely personal in his private capacity just as any other non-official or non-insured might have been accepted. The rules clearly lay down that Insurance Policies cannot be accepted as Collateral Security and according to the spirit of the Government Order communicated in your No.Fl.3644-6/G.F.78-23-2 of 7-1-24 there seems to be no justification in withholding the assurance due to an official standing as personal collateral security purely in his private capacity. In the case of

of

of Mr. Govindarajulu Naidu, Head Clerk, Chief Conservator's Office, Government have, however, stated that his insurance claim may not be paid until the principal produces some fresh security--vide G.O.No. Fl.41-20-21 dated 13th December 1929. The party is pressing for the settlement of the claim while there has been delay in offering and accepting another surety. Making his insurance amount liable for the Principal's dues being thus a matter not free from doubt, I request that the position of the surety in such cases may be made clear and he may be regarded as occupying the same position as another private person offered as security and his Government insurance amount treated as not liable for the Principal's dues.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Secretary,
Insurance Committee.

DS

To

H 4047/ G-1 dtd 6-11-30

The Secretary,
Mysore State Life Insurance
Committee, BANGALORE.

G-281-30-2.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No.14197 dated 13th February 1930 requesting that the position of the surety in the case of House Building or Motor Car Advancec may be made clear, I am directed to state that in view of the legal opinion (copy of which is enclosed herewith) and of the ruling contained in G.O.No.3644-6/G.F.78-13-2 dated 7th January 1924, Government accept your view contained in the last sentence of your communication under advertance, that the surety may be regarded as occupying the same position as any other private person offered the security and that the amount of the surety's policy in the State Life Insurance should not be treated as liable for the deficiency in the principal's dues. In these circumstances, no need arises for the registration of the names of such sureties in the books of the Insurance Office.

2. As regards the cases of principal debtors themselves, I am to state that these advances are sanctioned to them qua officers of Government as a concession incidental to their official position and so long as Rule 23 of the Insurance Rules is not abrogated, it is necessary that the Insurance Office should be apprised of the dues payable by the Insured to Government.

3. In these circumstances, the existing practice of sending copies of Government

Orders in such cases will continue for making a due note of such cases in your office registers.

I have etc.,

31.10.30

Finl. Secy. in charge.

H4048 dtd 6 11/30

Copy to the Comptroller, with compli-. ments, for information.

B.O.

31.10.30

Finl.Secy. to Govt.

Endd

Para 2 may be recast as follows:

As regards Municipal the cases of debtors themselves, I am to state that these advances are sanctioned to them qua officers of Govt. as a concession incidental to their official position & so long as Rule 23 of the Insurance Rules is not abrogated, it is necessary ~~absolutely~~ that the Insurance Office should be apprised of the dues payable by the Insured to Govt.

In these circumstances, the existing practice of sending copies of G.O's in such cases will continue to making a due note of such cases in your office registers.

30.10.32

WD

13.10.30

To

The Secretary

Mysore State Life Insurance

Committee, Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No.14197, dated 13th February 1930 requesting that the position of the surety in the case of House Building or Motor Car Advances may be made clear, I am directed to state that in view of the legal opinion (copy of which is enclosed herewith ~~sent~~) and of the ruling contained in G.O. No.3644-6/G.F. 78-13-2 dated 7th January 1924 Government accept your view contained in the last sentence of your communication under advertance, ~~but~~ that the surety may be regarded as occupying the same position as any other private person offered as security and that the amount of the surety's policy in the State Life Insurance should not be treated as liable for the deficiency in the principal's dues, In the circumstances, no need arises for the registration of the names of such sureties in the books of the Insurance Office.

2. As regards cases of principal debtors, I am to state that the need for considering the dues payable by the insured to Government on account of House Building, Motor Car and other advances as recoverable from their respective bonuses still continues in view of the fact that such advances would not have been sanctioned to them but for their official position and are also covered by rule 23 of the Insurance Rules which is not yet abrogated In these latter cases it would be necessary for the Insurance Office to note the dues

payable by the Insured to Government in its Registers so that there may be no omission to effect a recovery under the existing rules, should such aneventuality arise.

I have the honour to be

etc.,

14.10.30 Financial Secty. to Govt.

Copy to the Comptroller with compliments for information

ROUTINE NOTES.

etc., not intended for permanent record.]

The L.S.G. Branch may be consulted as to whether the connected papers are in that Branch.—(Dy: M: 12/7)

S.C./S.H. L.S.G. with Compts

26-6-30

They are not in the L.S.G. Please comment. Appears that Books or Non-Narrative Section

20/6/30

The file relates perhaps to the Fin. Branch which may perhaps be consulted. The file does not here.

2d 24/6

Fin Br with compts 26/6/30

The Meeting regd. F. 7 28-23 is not to this Branch with compliments

G.M.

D. M. Dev. Branch to kindly look up the file referred to as A.

30/6/30. 30.6.30

The collection is not in the Fin. Br

1/7

The collection required does not relate to Dev Br: It is not

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

Clear why this file has been sent to this branch

This may kindly be acknowledged

4.7.30. Suppd. Fin. Br with compts.

Rule 23.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.
----:0:---

R e a d:-

Petition dated 22nd September 1923 from Mrs. Lakshmidevamma, widow of the late Mr. T. Lakshminarasimha Rao, Auditor, Mysore Railways, representing that the amount due on her husband's policies of State Life Insurance may be paid to her as the nominee appointed by him and that it may not be utilised for the repayment of the loan barrowed by him from Government on the Security of immovable property.

Order No.Fl.3644-6/G.F.78-23-2 dated, Bangalore 7th January 1924.

Government consider that it is not right to make the assured amount liable for debts contracted by an insured officer otherwise than in his official capacity. The reservation in Rule 23 of the Insurance Rules providing for "deduction of any amount that may be due to Government by the Insured," should be understood as applying only to the amounts payable by an insured to Government in his official capacity and not to those which he may owe to Government as a private person.

2. Government are accordingly pleased to direct that the Insurance amount payable on the policies of the late Mr. T. Lakshminarasimha Rao, be paid to his widow, who is reported to be the nominee appointed by him.

(sd) M.A. Rangachar,
For Financial Secretary to Government.

"COPY"

6/30.

DS

Assistant Secretary.
Insurance Committee.

6/6.